



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/766,751

01/29/2004

Jerry Moscovitch

BEW-007REIRCE

3642

959

7590

06/27/2006

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

VORTMAN, ANATOLY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/766,751	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOSCOVITCH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anatoly Vortman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006 (RCE and Amendment).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 62-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 62-64, 68-74 and 77-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 65-67, 75 and 76 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                                         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                                     | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/19/05 &amp; 3/6/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**  
***REISSUE APPLICATION***

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application on June 15, 2006, after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 15, 2006 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 62-64, 68-74, and 77-79, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US/5,687,939 to Moscovitch (cited on the original patent) taken alone, or alternatively in view of JP/3,291,722 to Toshiaki (of record).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 68, 71, 77, and 79, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 18, 19) a modular display system comprising: a base assembly (156); a first support arm (158) operably coupled to said base assembly (156); a second support arm (162) secured to said first support arm (158) and

Art Unit: 2835

having at least a pair of coupling assemblies (198, 204) for securing to portions of first (152) and second (154) liquid crystal display (LCD) panels, a third support arm secured to said first support arm (158) and having at least one or a pair of coupling assemblies for supporting the LCD panels on said third support arm (column 8, lines 1+); and wherein said third support arm may be readily detached from said first support arm to enable said display system to be modularly interchangeably configured as a two panel LCD display system. Moscovitch ('939) further teaches that multiple displays are useful when large amounts of information must be displayed or compared (column 1, lines 9+), but did not explicitly stated that display system may be configured as a three-support arm system having three or greater LCD display system.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer display's art at the time the invention was made, to simultaneously attach said second and a third support arms to the first support arm via additional coupling assemblies provided on the first support arm (158), in order to support additional LCD panels in order to augment system's capabilities of displaying and comparing large amounts of information, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Alternatively, Toshiaki teaches (Fig. 3) a computer system with three (3) LCD panels for displaying large amounts of information.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer display's art at the time the invention was made, to simultaneously attach said second and a third support arms of Moscovitch to the first support arm in order to support additional LCD panels, according to

Art Unit: 2835

the teachings of Toshiaki, in order to augment system's capabilities of displaying and comparing large amounts of information.

Regarding claims 2 and 4, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 19) that the second (third) support arm (162) includes three coupling assemblies (198, 202, 204) enabling said display panels to be supported adjacent each other in either a portrait or landscape positions.

Regarding claim 62, the first support arm (158) is inherently removably coupled to the base assembly (156) (i.e. system may be disassembled).

Regarding claims 63 and 64, Moscovitch teaches that the second and third support arms are interchangeable (column 8, lines 1+) and are *substantially* identical to the first support arm (158) (Fig. 19).

Regarding claims 69, 70, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 18, 19) that the first support arm (158) can support at least one display panel (152 or 154) (via arm (162)) and the second and third support arms can display at least two display panels (152, 154) (column 8, lines 1+).

Regarding claims 72 and 73, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 19) that the system is configurable as a one-arm support system having the first support arm (158) capable to support at least two display panels (152, 154).

Regarding claim 74, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 19) three coupling assemblies (198, 202, 204) on the support arm (162), wherein the arm (162) can support two display panels (152, 154) in either landscape orientation, using one pair of the three coupling assemblies (198, 202, 204), or portrait orientation, using another pair of the three coupling assemblies (198, 202, 204).

Regarding claim 78, Moscovitch disclosed (Fig. 19) that the first support arm (158) is vertically securable to the base (156).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

4. Claims 65-67, 75, and 76, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

regarding claim 65, the claim recites: “a column coupling assembly”;

regarding claims 66 and 67, claim 66 recites: “three panels in a pyramid shape” and “in an inverted pyramid shape”;

regarding claims 75 and 76, each of the claims recites: “in the two-support arm system, the second support arm can support two display panels in either landscape orientation, using one pair of the three coupling assemblies of the second support arm, or portrait orientation, using another pair of the three coupling assemblies of the second support arm”. Further, claim 76 recites: “in the three-support arm system, i) the second support arm can support two display panels in either landscape orientation, using one pair of the three coupling assemblies of the second support arm, or portrait orientation, using another pair of the three coupling assemblies of the second support arm, and ii) the third support arm can support two display panels in either the landscape orientation, using one pair of the three coupling assemblies of the third support arm, or portrait orientation, using another pair of the three coupling assemblies of the third support arm”.

The aforementioned limitations in combination with all remaining limitations of the respective claims and with all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, are

believed to render the subject matter of claims 65-67, 75, and 76 allowable over the art of record.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant is reminded of the continuing obligation under 37 CFR 1.178(b), to timely apprise the Office of any prior or concurrent proceeding in which U.S. Patent No. 6,343,006 is or was involved. These proceedings would include interferences, reissues, reexaminations, and litigation.

Applicant is further reminded of the continuing obligation under 37 CFR 1.56, to timely apprise the Office of any information which is material to patentability of the claims under consideration in this reissue application.

These obligations rest with each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of this application for reissue. See also MPEP §§ 1404, 1442.01 and 1442.04.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anatoly Vortman whose telephone number is 571-272-2047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, between 10:00 am and 6:30 pm..

Art Unit: 2835

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Lynn Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anatoly Vortman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2835

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Vortman', with a long horizontal line extending to the right towards the printed name.

AV